## REMARKS

In the office action mailed June 10, 2005 the Examiner rejected claims 1-14. The June 10, 2005 Office action has been carefully considered. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the following remarks.

### 35 USC § 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Seo et al. (U.S. Patent 6838836; hereinafter called "Seo").

The Applicants respectfully submit that Seo does not qualify as a 102(b) art. Seo was not patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country more than one year prior to the date of filing of the present application for patent in the United States. The present application was filed on November 14, 2003. The Seo patent issued on January 4, 2005 and the pre-grant publication 2004000866 was published January 1, 2004, both dates, post-dating the filing date of the present application. Therefore, Seo does not qualify as a 102(b) art.

Furthermore, with respect to any 102 rejection, Seo does not teach or disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 8, and hence claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, and 13 are not anticipated by Seo.

Claims 1 and 8 of the present application recite white light emitting devices comprising at least one light emissive polymer and at least one small molecule material in two layers adjacent to each other, wherein the at least one small molecule material has a wide enough bandgap and a high enough electron mobility to function as both a hole blocking layer and an electron transport layer. Throughout the specification, and in particular in paragraphs [0029] – [0035] of the present application, the Applicants teach and disclose embodiments of such devices of the present invention.

In contradistinction, Seo does not teach or disclose any device capable of white light emission with the combination of elements as recited in claims 1 and 8 of the present application. Although, Seo appears to disclose a few non-polymeric light emitting materials, Seo fails to disclose even one light emitting polymer.

The Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13 are not anticipated by Seo and are in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 7, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Seo as applied to claims 1, 8, and further in view of Duggal et al (U.S. Pre-grant Publication 2001003135; hereinafter called "Duggal").

The Applicants submit that as claims 1 and 8 are in condition for allowance for reasons set forth above, claims 2 and 7, which depend on claim 1, and claims 9 and 14, which depend on claim 8, are also in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, the Seo and Duggal references, taken separately or in combination, do not suggest a device capable of white light emission comprising at least one light emissive polymer and at least one small molecule material in two layers adjacent to each other, wherein the at least one small molecule material has a wide enough bandgap and a high enough electron mobility to function as both a hole blocking layer and an electron transport layer, or a means of preparing such a device.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 7, 9 and 11 recite patentable subject matter over Seo in view of Duggal, and therefore claims 2,7, 9 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew J. Caruso
Reg. No. 48,520

General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A71
Niskayuna, New York 12309
September 12, 2005
Telephone: (518) 387-7354